

REMARKS

Claims 84-119 remain in the present application. Claims 84, 96 and 108 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the rejection states that the limitations “a second display screen overlapping said first display screen” are not shown in the drawings.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully assert that all drawings in the present application – e.g., Figures 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b – all show two overlapping display screens. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the drawings overcome this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 84-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the rejection states that several claim limitations contain new matter. However, Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that Claims 84-119 do not contain new matter for reasons set forth below.

The limitations “a second display screen overlapping said first display screen” as recited in Claims 84, 96 and 108 may be supported by all Figures as

discussed above. Additionally, these limitations are supported in numerous portions of the specification which each refer to a "layered configuration" of multiple screens. And as another example, the claimed limitations are supported by lines 2-4 of page 7 which describe that "a simple click of a mouse button causes cursor 3 to appear in exactly the same x y coordinates as on the foreground screen one, but, positioned on the background screen 2."

The limitation "an active display screen" as recited in Claims 84, 96 and 108 may be supported by, for example, lines 6-8 of page 5. Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand a selected display screen for interaction with a user to be an "active display screen" as claimed.

The limitation "transition" as recited in Claim 89 may be supported by, for example, lines 20-22 of page 4, lines 20-24 of page 5, lines 4-6 of page 6, etc.

The limitation "second input" may be supported by, for example, lines 16-17 of page 3, lines 21-22 of page 3, lines 9-11 of page 4, lines 19-20 of page 4, lines 21-23 of page 5, etc.

The limitation "adjusting" may be supported by, for example, lines 16-17 of page 3, lines 21-22 of page 3, lines 16-17 of page 3, line 1 of page 5 to line 7 of page 6, etc.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 overcome the rejections of record.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 84-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,246,407 to Wilks et al. (hereafter referred to as “Wilks”). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 84-119 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 84 that recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a multi-component display comprising:
 a first display screen; and
 a second display screen overlapping said first display
 screen; and
 a user interface component for designating at least one of said first and second display screens as an active display screen for responding to an input.

Independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84. Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Wilks fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a first display screen” and “a second display screen overlapping said first display screen” as recited in independent Claim 84. As recited and described in the present application, a multi-component display comprises a first display screen and a second display screen, where the second display screen overlaps said first display screen.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Wilks to teach a *single* computer screen 10 as shown in Figures 1-3 of Wilks. Applicants

respectfully assert that a single computer screen as taught by Wilks is very different from multiple display screens, for example as shown in Figures 1a-3b of the present application, and as claimed. Accordingly, Wilks teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching objects displayed on a *single* computer screen instead of a *first and second* display screen as claimed.

Although page 4 of the rejection suggests that the windows (e.g., 14, 26, etc.) displayed on Wilks' computer screen 10 are display screens as claimed, Applicants respectfully assert that that the windows are merely graphical objects. Applicants further assert that graphical objects displayed on a display screen are very different from a display screen capable of displaying graphical objects. Moreover, Wilks makes this distinction clear by teaching that the multiple windows are all displayed on the single computer screen 10 (Abstract; Figures 1-5; col. 2, lines 31-39), and further that the windows are "graphical user interface objects" (col. 2, lines 38-39). Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Wilks teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 84 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Since independent Claims 96 and 108 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 84, independent Claims 96 and 108 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Since dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 85-95, 97-107 and 109-119 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Wilks. Thus, Claims 84-119 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 84-119 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Please direct all future correspondence to the below address:

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 8/21, 2007

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060